



Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Docket Number (Optional)

103544;00999US25

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on

Aug. 10, 2005

Signature

Laura E. B. McGinn

Typed or printed name

Laura E. B. McGinn

Application Number

09/502,133

Filed

February 11, 2000

First Named Inventor

Harold E. Helson

Art Unit

2123

Examiner

W.D. Thomson

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐

applicant/inventor.

☐

assignee of record of the entire interest.  
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/96)

☐

attorney or agent of record.  
Registration number \_\_\_\_\_

☒

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 35,761

Signature

Rajesh Vallabh

Typed or printed name

617-526-6505

Telephone number

8-10-05

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

☐

\*Total of \_\_\_\_\_ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Harold E. Helson

Serial No.: 09/502,133

Group Art Unit: 2123

Filed: February 11, 2000

Examiner: William D. Thomson

Title: **ENHANCING STRUCTURE DIAGRAM GENERATION**

\*\*\*\*\*

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on August 10, 2005.

*Laura E. McGinn*

\*\*\*\*\*

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

In the final office action dated February 11, 2005, the Examiner rejected pending claims 1, 5, 9 and 13-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,434,796 issued to Weininger ("Weininger") in view of User's Guide to CS ChemFinder 4.0 ("ChemFinder") and Chem3D CH 1997 ("Chem3D").

It is apparent from the office action that the Examiner has (1) rejected independent claims 1, 5 and 9 over the combination of Weininger and ChemFinder, and (2) rejected remaining claims 13-27 over the combination of Weininger, ChemFinder, and Chem3D.

For the reasons set forth below, each of these rejections should be withdrawn.

**I. Independent Claim 1 and Dependent Claims 13-27**

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for use in deriving a chemical structure diagram. The method features the steps of identifying, from a connection table for a chemical structure, an instance of chemical structural symmetry in the chemical structure; representing the instance of symmetry as a list of groups of equivalent atoms and bonds; and expressing the instance of chemical structural symmetry in the chemical structure diagram.

The Examiner contends that Weininger discloses all the limitations of claim 1 except representing the instance of symmetry as a list of groups of equivalent atoms and bonds. The Examiner contends that ChemFinder discloses this element on pp. 82-83 “substituents” and 89-90 “similarity rules,” and that it would have been obvious to combine these references.

This rejection should be withdrawn for a number of reasons. First, contrary to the Examiner’s assertions, Weininger does not disclose or suggest identifying, from a connection table for a chemical structure, an instance of chemical structural symmetry in the chemical structure. In fact, Weininger does not disclose or suggest identifying any chemical structural symmetry. (The word “symmetry” does not appear to be mentioned anywhere in the reference.) The particular passage of Weininger cited by the Examiner (col. 8, lines 19-60) only discloses use of different types of digital encoding for representing molecules and their structures. There is no disclosure or suggestion of identifying chemical structural symmetry.

Second, ChemFinder does not disclose or suggest representing the instance of symmetry as a list of groups of equivalent atoms and bonds. The particular portion of ChemFinder cited by the Examiner (pp. 82-83 “substituents” and 89-90 “similarity rules”) relates to pattern matching. In particular, it specifies that a query will match target structures when they contain the query as a substructure. Such pattern matching does not relate to and is not symmetry. (The Examiner acknowledges that ChemFinder also does not disclose this step.)

Third, neither reference discloses expressing the instance of chemical structural symmetry in the chemical structure diagram. The portion of the Weininger reference cited by the Examiner for supposedly disclosing this element specifies that aromatic rings (rings with

circles drawn inside them) are chemically equivalent to rings with alternating single and double bonds. This does not relate to symmetry in a chemical structure diagram.

The combination of Weininger and ChemFinder thus fails to disclose or suggest multiple elements of claim 1. In addition, the Chem3D reference (cited against other claims) fails to cure the defects of Weininger and ChemFinder.

Independent claim 1 is therefore patentable over the cited references. Furthermore, claims 13-27 depend on claim 1 and are also patentable over these references.

## **II. Independent Claim 5**

Independent claim 5 was also rejected over the combination of Weininger and ChemFinder. Claim 5 is patentable over these references because, as explained above, neither reference discloses identifying, from a connection table for a chemical structure, an instance of chemical structural symmetry in the chemical structure. In addition, neither Weininger, nor ChemFinder discloses representing the instance of symmetry as a list of groups of equivalent atoms and bonds. Furthermore, as mentioned above, neither reference discloses expressing the instance of chemical structural symmetry in the chemical structure diagram.

The rejection of claim 5 should therefore be withdrawn.

## **III. Independent Claim 9**

Independent claim 9 was also rejected over the combination of Weininger and ChemFinder. Claim 9 is patentable over these references because neither reference discloses computer software that can be used to identify, from a connection table for a chemical structure, an instance of chemical structural symmetry in the chemical structure. In addition, neither reference discloses computer software that can represent the instance of symmetry as a list of groups of equivalent atoms and bonds. Moreover, neither reference discloses computer software that can be used to express the instance of chemical structural symmetry in the chemical structure diagram.

The rejection of claim 9 should therefore be withdrawn.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Claims 1, 5, 9 and 13-27 are pending in the present application. For the reasons set forth above, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency, or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Rajesh Vallabh  
Registration No. 35,761  
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: August 10, 2005

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
Tel.: (617) 526-6010  
Fax: (617) 526-5000